UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/573,301	03/22/2006	Kazuya Kaida	65140(70551)	9567
	7590 08/27/201 NGELL PALMER & D	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 5587	<b>'</b> 4	KIM, RICHARD H		
BOSTON, MA 02205			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		2871		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/27/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/573,301	KAIDA ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
RICHARD H. KIM	2871		

	RICHARD H. KIM	2871					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>10 August 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AI	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.					
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appel for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth a ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE f).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FII	n. LED WITHIN TWO				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ension and the corresponding amount of thortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as				
NOTICE OF APPEAL	"						
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be	out prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered be	causo				
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	nsideration and/or search (see NOTw);	E below);					
<ul> <li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or</li> <li>(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.</li> </ul>							
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	sorresponding number of finding reje	otod oldiirio.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).							
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):							
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).							
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:							
Claim(s) rejected:  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu	t before or on the date of filing a No	stice of Δnneal will not	he entered				
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	d sufficient reasons why the affidavi	t or other evidence is	necessary and				
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a				
10.  ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
	/Richard H Kim/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 2871					

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant argues that the claimed invention would not have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art in view of any combination of Horiuchi, Uh and Oshima.

Firstly, Applicant argues that Horiuchi does not disclose "that prior to the sealant arranging step, a deaerating step of arranging in a pressure reduced atmosphere at least a substrate on which the sealant is to be arranged out of the two substrates" since "the pressure-reduced atmosphere (evacuating the vacuum chamber) is not performed until after the substrates are arranged in the vacuum chamber". Examiner respectfully submits that in paragaph [0032], Horiuchi discloses that after the vacuum chamber is evacuated, the glass substrate (3) is brought down upon the lower plate, pressing the plastic substrate (1) on the rougened plate (102) against the lower plate (101). Therefore, since after the vacuum chamber is evacuated, the plastic substrate is pressed against the lower plate (101), Examiner submits that Horiuchi discloses that "at least one substrate is arranged in a pressure-reduce atmosphere."

Secondly, in response to Applicant's argument that Horiuchi in paragraph [0035] and Fig. 5A, relates to a different embodiment from Fig. 3A, Examiner respectfully submits that the description disclosed in paragraph [0035] and Fig. 5A, relates to subsequent steps of the same embodiment disclosed in Fig. 3A-Fig. 4B. As evidence of this, Horichi discloses in line 1, of paragraph [0035] that the steps in Fig. 5a, is performed "thereafter" the steps performed in the previous figures and corresponding descriptions. Therefore, Horiuchi discloses "evacuating the vacuum chamber prior to the sealant arranging step".

Thirdly, in response to Applicant's argument that Horiuchi does not disclose "prior to the bonding step, a releasing step of releasing said pressure-reduced atmosphere", Examiner submits that since Fig. 5a represents steps of the same embodiment disclosed in Fig. 3a-4b, Horiuchi discloses a releasing step ([paragraph 0033]) performed prior to a bonding step (paragraph [0035]; Fig. 5a).

Therefore, Horiuchi discloses "a deareating step of arranging in a pressure-reduced atmopshere at least a substrate on which said sealant is to be arranged out of said two substrate' is performed prior to the sealant arranging step".

In response to Applicant's argument that Uh fails to teach or suggest the steps of "to be performed prior to said sealant arranging step, a dearating step of arranging in a pressure-reduced atmosphere at least a substrate on which the sealant is to be arranged out of said two substrate; and to be performed prior to said bonding step, a releasing step of releasing said pressure-reduced atmosphere by an inert gas", Examiner submits that Uh was incorporated to teach the limitation not disclosed in Horiuchi, specifically the step of "liquid crystal dropping". As disclosed in Uh, dropping liquid crystal material before the substrates are bonded provides the advantage of minimizing liquid crystal composition, cost and waste (col. 3, lines 58-60).

T